

JAMES E. WHITMIRE, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 6533  
[jwhitmire@nevadafirm.com](mailto:jwhitmire@nevadafirm.com)  
F. THOMAS EDWARDS, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 9549  
[tedwards@nevadafirm.com](mailto:tedwards@nevadafirm.com)  
SANTORO, DRIGGS, WALCH,  
KEARNEY, HOLLEY & THOMPSON  
400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
Telephone: 702/791-0308  
Facsimile: 702/791-1912

*Attorneys for Defendants*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

EDDIE PAGE and IAN BLANKENSHIP,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GRANDVIEW MARKETING, INC.; KEVIN  
M. SHEEHAN, individually; and "John Doe"  
Entities 1 to 25, name and number unknown,

Defendants.

Base File:  
CASE NO.: 2:09-cv-01150-RCJ-GWF

Consolidated with:  
CASE NO.: 2:09-cv-01152- RCJ-GWF

Hearing Date: November 9, 2009  
Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.

**ORDER GRANTING, IN PART, PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CONDITIONAL  
CERTIFICATION OF A COLLECTIVE ACTION AND MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE OF  
INFORMATION RELATED TO POTENTIAL CLASS MEMBERS**

This matter came before the Court on November 9, 2009 at 9:00 a.m. upon Plaintiffs Motion for Conditional Certification of a Collective Action and Motion for disclosure of Information Related to Potential Class Members ("Plaintiffs' Motion"). *Dkt. No. 33*. Plaintiffs Eddie Page and Ian Blankenship appeared through their attorney Trang Q. Tran, Esq. of the Tran Law Firm. Defendants Grandview Marketing, Inc. and Kevin M. Sheehan appeared through their attorneys James E. Whitmire, Esq. and F. Thomas Edwards, Esq. of the law firm Santoro, Driggs, Walch, Kearney, Holley & Thompson. The Court reviewed all the pleadings and papers on file herein, heard the arguments of counsel and good cause appearing:

1 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs Motion is granted in part as follows:

2 1. The putative class defined in Plaintiffs' Complaint is conditionally certified  
3 pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), subject to Defendants right to file a motion for decertification  
4 later in the proceedings.<sup>1</sup>

5 2. The parties shall meet and confer to develop the form of notice to be sent to the  
6 putative class members. The notice shall be consistent with the directives given by the Court and  
7 the notice previously approved in Williams v. Trendwest Resorts, Inc., 2:05-cv-00605-RCJ-LRL.

8 3. Within fourteen (14) days of approval (by court order or stipulation of the parties)  
9 of a form of notice, Defendants are required to provide to Plaintiffs the names and last known  
10 addresses of the individuals who meet the putative class definition. In the event that Defendants  
11 know that a putative class member's contact information is incorrect and have more recent valid  
12 contact information, such alternative information shall be provided to Plaintiff's counsel.

13 4. Plaintiffs shall have ten (10) days from receipt of the names and addresses of  
14 putative class members in which to circulate the notice at Plaintiffs' counsel's expense.

15 5. Putative class members shall have ninety (90) days from circulation of the notice  
16 of pendency in which to opt in to this action.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 DATED: December 8, 2009

19  
20   
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
22  
23  
24

25 <sup>1</sup> Paragraph 16 of the Complaint describes the class as:

26 All current and former U.S. based employees of Grandview Marketing, Inc., who  
27 (1) supervised other employees at time share promotional booths, (2) but did not  
28 participate in hiring and firing decisions, and (3) who worked more than forty (40)  
hours per week without receiving payment for overtime ant one and a half times  
their regular rate.

1 Respectfully submitted by:

2 

3 \_\_\_\_\_  
4 James E. Whitnire, Esq.

5 F. Thomas Edwards, Esq.

6 SANTORO, DRIGGS, WALCH,  
KEARNEY, HOLLEY & THOMPSON

*Attorneys for Defendants*

7 Approved as to form:

8 

9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10 Trang Q. Tran, Esq.

11 TRAN LAW FIRM

*Attorney for Plaintiffs*

SANTORO, DRIGGS, WALCH,  
KEARNEY, HOLLEY & THOMPSON

